Ham-Digital Digest   Mon, 11 Oct 93   Volume 93 : Issue   70

Today's Topics:
                       AX.25 protocol with Linux?
                        Public Apology (4 msgs)
                       Public Apology - get real!
                 Z-80B CPU and SIO/0 Source? (2 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1993 11:57:23 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!sunic!news.funet.fi!ousrvr.oulu.fi!oulu.fi!
luru@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: AX.25 protocol with Linux?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <terryd.750239199@extro.ucc.su.OZ.AU> terryd@extro.ucc.su.OZ.AU (Terry
Dawson) writes:

> riku@juha.fi (Riku Kalinen) writes:
> >Does there exist any support for AX.25 packet radio protocol in Linux?

> If you can wait just a short while, the in-kernel ax.25 code
> should be ready.

> All you will need is a tnc capable of kiss operation initially.

Sounds cool. I wonder if anyone is working with the Ottawa PI board
driver yet?

Luru

Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1993 10:24:06 +0000
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!uknet!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!
dave@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Depending on whether I calmed down before I finished typing, I would put the
guy in my reject file and never handle anything of his again. If I calmed down
enough I would just put him on hold.

Sending stuff via packet is a priviledge, not a right, so he is well out of
order.

Dave
--

****
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25   *   Start at the beginning. Go on   *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet *   until the end. Then stop.   *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org   Amprnet *   (the king to the white rabbit)   *
****

Date: 10 Oct 1993 17:27:25 +0100
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!warwick!unicorn.nott.ac.uk!
unicorn.nott.ac.uk!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Jeesus, what a loser. Packet BBS's (PBBS = Packet, not public :-)) are run
over here at least under the total authority of the sysop involved - the sysop
has the absolute final say over whether a message can sit on his hard disk or
not. This is in a way a kind of symptom of what's wrong with the network - this
jerk thinks he can threaten to sue someone for not carrying one of his
messages, when in actual fact as the originator he has no legal rights AT ALL
concerning where his message can go. People are beginning to take the system
for granted and assume that they can do anything they want.

Grr. This has put me in a bad mood now - howsabout locking this guy out of the
entire network? *grin*

73 Mike

(off to punch a sack of potatos for half an hour to stop feeling quite so
livid)

--
+------------------------- O Mike Knell, University of Nottingham, UK -+
| Nevertheless..   -/ \- Internet: eeyimkn@unicorn.nott.ac.uk |
| the Turtle Moves!   -_/- AX25: g7gpa@gb7bad.#23.gbr.eu |
+--M.T.V. - GET OFF THE AIR!-- | AMPRnet: mpk@hobbes.g7gpa.ampr.org -------+

Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1993 16:58:46 GMT
From: valinor.mythical.com!n5ial!jim@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Question---the messages that started all this weren't, by any chance,
originally dated 1 April, were they? That's about the only way they could
even begin to be taken seriously...as a good April Fool's prank. :-)

In article <CEKy1n.Cvr@hawnews.watson.ibm.com> kf5mg@vnet.ibm.com
(Jack Snodgrass) writes:

>What follows is the text of the Apology and the message that
>triggered it. The message is a hoot. I moved the SMTP headers
>to the bottom of the note for viewing. The rest of the note is
>'as is'.

You're right---the message that triggered the apology is funny. To think
that the author actually believes that the sysop of a packet BBS is ``in
serious violation of the law by killing my message if you operate a PBBS''
is truly funny. Such stupidity.....makes you wonder how the guy managed
to get a license, doesn't it?

I almost wish I'd been the sysop in question...let the guy try to get me in
court...see who comes out of it with their nose bloodied (won't be me). :-)

If it's *MY* license associated with the packet BBS (and therefore, my
license that's at stake if the FCC doesn't like some message's content),
I alone will be the judge of whether or not something gets transmitted.
If someone doesn't like that, they are free to route it a different way.
As most of us all realize, packet BBS systems are a *LOT* different than
landline BBSs, and an entirely different set of rules apply (e.g., if the
sysop on a BBS or public access system I was using were monitoring my
e-mail, and I found out about it, I'd be mad as hell...but this is
basically required on packet BBSs, due to the current FCC regs, and I
wouldn't think twice about it, and would, in fact, expect it).

```
>>>``PBBS (PUBLIC BBS -- with the accentuation on the word PUBLIC!).

Hmmmm...I've never heard a packet BBS called a Public BBS before.  :-)

>>>seen around the country soon, then your name WILL appear in QST as another
>>>loser, and you WILL lose your license, and you WILL pay a stiff fine.  Go
>>>ahead, don't take me seriously.  Go ahead, MAKE MY DAY!

Can you say, ``idle threats'' ???  I knew you could.....

Later,
   --jim

--
#include <std_disclaimer.h>                              73 DE N5IAL (/4)
------------------------< Running Linux 0.99 PL10 >-------------------------
INTERNET: jim@n5ial.mythical.com  |  j.graham@ieee.org    ICBM: 30.23N 86.32W
AMATEUR RADIO:  (packet station temporarily offline)      AMTOR SELCAL: NIAL
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
E-mail me for information about KAMterm (host mode for Kantronics TNCs).

------------------------------

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 06:54:58 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!torn!nott!cunews!freenet.carleton.ca!
Freenet.carleton.ca!ai389@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Having read the complainants demand for an apology, I can`t escpe the
feeling that we`re all being had......he must have had his tongue firmly
stuck in his cheek.

--
     _____  |  RR 3 Almonte On Canada K0A 1A0. 613-256-3865
     Tim Ray     |  AMPRnet: ve3xv.ampr.org[44.135.96.80]
     _____  |  HAM BBS: VE3XV@VE3OSQ.#EON.CA.NA
                 |  internet (e-mail): ai389@Freenet.carleton.ca

------------------------------

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 01:28:30 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.uiowa.edu!icaen.uiowa.edu!drenze@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Public Apology - get real!
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu
```

MARK@ardsley.business.uwo.ca (Mark_Bramwell) writes:
[quoting the idiot who started the whole thing in the first place]
>> I am, at this very
>>moment, consulting with my attorney about ways to prosecute you. Even IF i

>>You, my friend, have made a grave error. You stand to lose considerably. If
>>possible, I intend to have your liscense over this issue. If you think I'm
>>just blowing steam, please think about how long it has taken me to reply to
>>your message -- obviously a lot of thought and work has gone into the project.
>> You, sir, will be off the air FOREVER! Now, how do you feel? Do you want
>>to delete any more of my messages? Your liscense is mine!

>ps: I do believe the 'p' in pbbs is 'packet' NOT 'public'.

Ayup...not to mention that, in the US, even the owner of a landline bbs has
the right to review any and all messages/files posted to his board and delete
those which he feels are inappropriate. Read the Electronic Privacy Act.
...many BBS's post the relevant portions as a login screen for new users.
     After all, if something illegal is suspected of being posted on
a BBS, it's the operator's machines which are confiscated, not the poster's!
Just ask Steve Jackson Games about this one.

73, Doug

--
 __   /| | Douglas J Renze, N0YVW |
 \'o.O' | +1 319 337 4664 | In God We Trust:
 =(___)= | drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu | All Others Pay Cash
    U | Douglas-Renze@uiowa.edu |

Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1993 14:35:50 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-
feed-1.peachnet.edu!nscf!lakes!jcox@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Z-80B CPU and SIO/0 Source?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

I'm in the process of upgrading an MFJ-1274 TNC to run TheNet X1J. In
order to switch to the higher speed clock (4.9 MHz), I understand that I
need to install a "B" series (6Mhz) Z-80 CPU and SIO/0 chip. I have
found several sources (JDR, Jameco, etc) for the CPU chip, but have yet
to find one for the SIO/0 chip. Any suggestions out there?

73, John

Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1993 21:02:23 +0000
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uknet!
demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Z-80B CPU and SIO/0 Source?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <F3k8ac1w165w@lakes.trenton.sc.us> jcox@lakes.trenton.sc.us (John Cox)
writes:
>
>I'm in the process of upgrading an MFJ-1274 TNC to run TheNet X1J. In
>order to switch to the higher speed clock (4.9 MHz), I understand that I
>need to install a "B" series (6Mhz) Z-80 CPU and SIO/0 chip. I have
>found several sources (JDR, Jameco, etc) for the CPU chip, but have yet
>to find one for the SIO/0 chip. Any suggestions out there?
>
If you have 'A' versions, try those at the higher speed... you may well
find that they work. If you are putting the TNC on a remote site then get
the 'B' version though, cos otherwise, by Murphy's Law, it will go wrong at
the most inconvenient time.

Dave
--

****
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25   *   Start at the beginning. Go on   *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet *   until the end. Then stop.   *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org   Amprnet *   (the king to the white rabbit) *
****

Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1993 18:56:04 +0000
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uknet!demon!djwhome.demon.co.uk!
david@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep29.184626.18738@brtph560.bnr.ca>,
<749689899snx@djwhome.demon.co.uk>, <1993Oct4.202127.2001@ualr.edu>
Reply-To : david@djwhome.demon.co.uk
Subject : Re: Soundblaster (tm) for multi-mode digital communications

In article <1993Oct4.202127.2001@ualr.edu> bross@quapaw.astate.edu (Brian Ross)
writes:
>
>: The original [FFTMORSE] has problems with
>: SB Pros (I could post my fix for it on the condition that I get feedback on

>: whether it works - it reportedly does not always do so).
>
Here is part of a posting originally made to CompuServe, by me:

<<<<<<<
If you have tried to use the FFTMORSE program by Francois Jalbert on a Sound
Blaster Pro, you may be interested in the following procedure which makes it
work for me on a Pro 2. I would like to know if you succeed or fail using
it, as the original author tried changing the source in a similar way and
sending it to someone who failed to use it on a Sound Blaster Pro before; it
did not work for them.

The procedure is to run debug with the following input (which may be taken
from a file with <):

g 2a
t
g 155
t
a 1822
nop
                ----- this line is blank!
g
q

This works with the 1st May 1992 version of the binary. The "g 2a; t"
sequence gets through the code which moves the lzexe decompressor out of the
way of the program. The "g 155; t" sequence gets to the end of the
decompressor. In both cases the t steps through an instruction which
changes the code segment. The "a 1822; nop" sequence patches out the OUT
instruction which writes a speaker on command to the Sound Blaster.

Note that the program ceases to respond to the keyboard if you use control-C
or control-BREAK; this is not a hardware compatibility problem. ESC is the
approved method of terminating it.
>>>>>>>

If you have the right compilers and libraries, you can just remove the
speaker on-call.

Note that the program only really works on clean signals. I have adapted
it for GCC, and have been trying to improve it, but my current version is
still very half baked.

>I have a Pro Audio Spectrum 16 and a 486/33, and I can't get this program to
>work. I also can't get a program called DTMF that is supposed to decode
>DTMF tones to work. (it was based on FFTMORSE) I tried it on a friend's
>computer (he has a 486/25 and a SB 1.0) and it wouldn't work either.

>The docs say that it uses the clock on the SB for timing, so I guess the
>speed of the computer wouldn't affect it that much.

I haven't tried this, so I can't say much about it. FFTMORSE doesn't use
the SB for timing, except in as much as it samples no faster that the
fastest sampling rate. Incidentally, it needs a dedicated machine to get
reasonable timing. It is possible that a really fast machine might
violate some of the settling time constraints on the SB, but that doesn't
seem to have been my problem.
--
David Woolley, London, England   david@djwhome.demon.co.uk

End of Ham-Digital Digest V93 #70
****